



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

# AMERICAN JOURNAL OF PHILOLOGY

---

VOL. XI, 3.

WHOLE No. 43.

---

## I.—ON THE ARTICULAR INFINITIVE IN POLYBIUS.<sup>1</sup>

### I.

In the following paper I have taken Hultsch's text of Polybius (books I–III in the second edition) as the basis of my work, and all the references are to the book, chapter and section in his edition. I have referred frequently to Schweighäuser's edition and notes, and his lexicon has been of great value to me. Of the studies on Polybius' text and language those to which I am most indebted are: Hultsch's Preface to his second edition, 1888; F. Krebs, *Die Präpositionen bei Polybius*, 1882, and *Die Präpositionsadverbien in der späteren historischen Gräcität*, Part I, 1884, Part II, 1885.

Kaelker, *Quaestiones de elocutione Polybiana*, 1880 (Leipziger Studien, Vol. III); J. Stich, *De Polybii dicendi genere* (Acta Sem. Philol. Erlang. II); L. Goetzeler, *De Polybi elocutione*, 1887, are occasionally referred to.

For the theory and development of the articular infinitive I am indebted to Prof. Gildersleeve's articles in the Transactions of the American Philological Association for 1878, and in the American Journal of Philology, Vols. III and VIII; to Weiske's two papers in Fleckeisen's Jahrbuch for 1882, pp. 494 and 528, in which he enumerates every occurrence of the construction in Attic prose; and to Birklein's *Entwicklungsgeschichte des substantivierten Infinitivs*, 1888, which gives in a handy form an account of the development of the construction from Pindar to Xenophon. It

<sup>1</sup> The above paper embodies the results of studies pursued during the author's tenure of a Bishop Berkeley Fellowship at Owens College, Manchester, England.

is to be regretted that Aristotle's use of this construction has not yet been examined.

1. It has already been shown that while a historical development in the use of the article with an infinitive in 'classical' Greek can distinctly be traced, from the simple infinitive with *τὸ* in Pindar to the substantivizing of a complex sentence in all sorts of case-relations in Attic prose (see Birklein, p. 91), at the same time both individual bent and the class of writing played their parts in the variations and the rise and fall of its use. As Prof. Gildersleeve says (A. J. P. III 197), 'the use of the articular infinitive is not simply a matter of period, but a matter of individual character and artistic school.'

In this essay I propose to apply the same methods of statistic which have been employed on the classical use of the articular infinitive, to an examination of the same element in the language of Polybius; an examination which will be of interest, and of some importance both from a comparative point of view and in regard to Polybius' own style. Thus I shall endeavor to connect Polybius' usage with that of the classical prosaists in a comparison by which the development of the construction may be estimated, and to provide material in which Polybius' method of thought and the turns of his language may be studied; for 'the articular infinitive is a gnomon of the reflective element and cannot be left out in a consideration of style' (Gildersleeve, Am. Philol. Assoc. 1878, p. 18).

The position of Polybius is one of prominence in the history of later Greek prose. He is in date and importance the first of a succession of writers in the *κοινή διάλεκτος*, and the traces of Polybius' influence are to be clearly seen in the writers who follow him. If the term *κοινή διάλεκτος* in reference to Polybius is calculated to lead to confusion, we may say that he writes in the Attic dialect but not in the Attic style; that in all essentials but that of pureness of vocabulary Polybius' dialect is Attic, though in detail he shows in syntax also many divergencies from Attic use.

It will thus be seen that in studying Polybius' language it is of importance to keep before us his relation with the Attic prosaists, because we are at a point where the threads of historical connection are most significant.

2. In the following statistical account of Polybius' usage of the articular infinitive I have calculated by the number of *articles*. It occurs altogether 1628 times, and in the following constructions:

nominative 151, subject accusative 75, object, etc., accus. 53, genitive 199, dative 80. With prepositions and quasi-prepositions governing the genitive: *περί* 26, *ὑπέρ* 26, *ἐκ* 22, *πρό* 12, *χάριν* 78, *ἐνεκα* 8, *πλήν* 5, *χωρίς* 4, *ἕως* 4, *ἐξω* 2, *ἀνευ* 2, *μέχρι* 2. With prepositions, etc., governing the dative: *ἐπί* 47, *πρός* 10, *ἐν* 21, *ἄμα* 102. With prepositions and the accusative: *διά* 441, *πρός* 134, *μετά* 29, *ἐπί* 31, *εἰς* 55, *περί* 8, *παρά* once.

In this list I have not separated the first five books in Polybius from the rest of his works which have come down to us. The first five books alone are preserved entire, of the rest we have only excerpts, mostly of considerable length. In Hultsch's edition books I-V occupy about a volume and a half, the excerpts about two volumes and a half. The average frequency (per page) of the articular infinitive is higher in the excerpts than in the first five books, being 1.180 : 1.109.

3. In the frequency of its occurrence the articular infinitive has a higher place in Polybius than in any classical author except Demosthenes. This relation will be best seen by the following comparison, in which I have adopted Birklein's counting of the classical occurrences. It occurs in Plato 1680 times, average per Teubner page .87; in Xenophon 1306 times, average 1.01; in Polybius 1628 times, average 1.15; in Demosthenes 788, average 1.20.

In estimating the force of these figures we must make allowance for the difference in character of the subject-matter. Oratory and philosophy, having more need of abstract phrases, of compendious and comprehensive locutions, are found to make more liberal use of the articular infinitive than history does. Thus in Thucydides (Gildersleeve, A. J. P. VIII, p. 330; Birklein, pp. 51, 52) the average of the art. inf. in the narrative is .30, while in the speeches it amounts to nearly 1; and thus we account for the higher frequency of the art. inf. in the excerpts of Polybius as compared with books I-V; books VI-end contain proportionally more of reflection and theorizing and less of narrative than the books preserved entire. But on the whole the *narrative* element with Polybius, as was natural with a writer of history, outweighs the reflective and historical. This being so, what we have to lay stress upon is the high frequency of the art. inf. in Polybius as compared with classical prose writers. It points to a real characteristic of his style, and of late Greek generally; to the 'conscious ratiocination, the increasing tendency towards the employment of

abstract nouns in various relations,' of which Prof. Gildersleeve (Trans. Am. Ph. Assoc. 1878, p. 18) describes the articular infinitive as the outcome, and which is further indicated in the large number of abstract nouns-substantive used by Polybius, many of which he coined himself. See Kaelker, l. c. pp. 296, 297, and Goetzeler, pp. 40, 41.

4. In the use of the articular infinitive as the equivalent of a noun, Polybius does not go beyond the limits fixed in Attic prose, for which see Birklein, p. 92. We find no approach in him to the later and vulgar use of an adjective instead of an adverb with the art. inf., or of a dependent genitive instead of a subject in the accus., such as those quoted by Gildersleeve, l. c. p. 7, from Ignatius, e. g. τὸ ἀληθινὸν ζῆν, τὸ ζῆν αὐτοῦ. And in the usages within the classical limits his innovations are few in number. In Polybius for the first time we find the genitive of the art. inf. used of *price* (only twice), ἅμα τῷ c. inf. used almost synonymously with μετὰ τὸ c. inf., γίνομαι and εἰμί with πρὸς τὸ and πρὸς τῷ c. inf., πρὸς τὸ c. inf. of purpose in strictly final clauses. Of these usages occurring for the first time, all except the first occur frequently and are characteristics of Polybius' style; especially common is ἅμα with the art. inf. Other features of his use of the art. inf. as compared with that in Attic prose generally are the following: increase in frequency of χάριν τοῦ c. inf., to which ἔνεκα gives way; of διὰ τὸ c. inf., of ἐπὶ τῷ c. inf. expressing the cause of emotion; of πρὸς τὸ and μετὰ τὸ c. inf.; frequency of ὁρμᾶν ἐπὶ τὸ c. inf., and of ἐλπὶς τοῦ c. inf., decrease of the τὸ-infinitive. Noticeable are τοῦ c. inf. of purpose, and the variety of the expressions of purpose with the art. inf.: χάριν, ἔνεκα τοῦ c. inf., ἐπὶ τῷ c. inf., πρὸς τὸ c. inf., besides the final τοῦ c. inf.

5. The articular infinitive presents in a handy substantival form either the abstract idea expressed by the simple infinitive, or an oratio obliqua in which the infinitive stands for the main verb, and the subject is in the accusative (or nominative); cf. Gildersleeve, l. c. p. 11. There are thus two distinct forms of the articular infinitive, the former of which is strictly the equivalent of an abstract noun, while the latter is a substantivized sentence, and in general a variation in phrase for what might otherwise have been expressed by a subordinate clause, relational or temporal, or by a participle. Of the former class Polybius very frequently employs τὸ ζῆν as an equivalent of ὁ βίος, the two occurring side by side in 12, 16, 12 τῷ μὲν ('to the one') ἔτη δύο ἢ τρία καταλείπεσθαι τοῦ ζῆν,

αὐτῷ δὲ τοῦ βίου τὸ πλεῖον ἔτι μένειν. So too he is fond of τὸ νικᾶν, κινδυνεύειν, βοηθεῖν, etc. It is interesting to note that there are certain constructions in Polybius with which the simple form of the art. inf. goes naturally. Thus (of course with exceptions) it is the simple abstract that is found when the art. inf. is the direct object of verbs, or in the genitive after verbs, or after *πρός, εἰς, ἐπὶ* τὸ (always), *περὶ* τὸ, *ἐν, ἐκ, ἔνεκα* and *χάριν*. On the other hand, it is the substantivized oratio obliqua that is usually found after *μετά* and *πρό;* while some constructions, e. g. the 'dynamic' dative, *ἐπὶ* τῷ, ἅμα τῷ, lend themselves equally to both forms. With the other usages, although both forms of the art. inf. are equally natural, the simpler is the more usual.

In a few passages we find the startling irregularity of an accusative with the art. inf. where the subject of the main clause and of the oratio obliqua is the same. 2, 18, 6 οὐκ ἐτόλμησαν ἀντεξαγαγεῖν Ῥωμαῖοι τὰ στρατόπεδα διὰ τὸ παραδόξου γενομένης τῆς ἐφόδου προκαταληφθῆναι καὶ μὴ καταταχῆσαι τὰς τῶν συμμάχων ἀθροίσαντας δυνάμεις. See Hultsch<sup>2</sup>, Praefat. p. l. Hultsch reverts here to the MSS reading ἀθροίσαντας, after having, in the first edition, preferred Bekker's conjecture ἀθροίσαντες. In doing so he follows Kaelker, p. 280, who compares the following passages where a similar accusative is found: 2, 7, 10 οὐδὲν ἐποιήσαντο προυργιαίτερον τοῦ παροπλίσαντας αὐτοὺς ἐμβαλεῖν εἰς πλοῖα. 3, 111, 2. 8, 31, 6 ἐλπίζων καὶ πρὸς αὐτὸν τι διατείνειν τὴν εὐαγρίαν διὰ τὸ μερίτην αἰεὶ γίνεσθαι, where, as Hultsch points out, the accusative is due to the influence of αὐτόν, but where Bekker conjectured μερίτης. Analogous to these is 9, 39, 6 πρέπον ὑμῖν ἐστὶ τὸ—μνησθέντας—μισοπονηρῆσαι, where one expects the dative as in 18, 14, 13.

The irregularity of the passages quoted is, as Hultsch, l. c. p. li, remarks, quite in keeping with the construction of the accusative referring to the subject which is found in oratio obliqua after *νομίζω*, etc., e. g. 1, 53, 10 νομίσαντες οὐκ ἀξιώχρεως σφᾶς αὐτοὺς εἶναι. See Hultsch, l. c. p. xliv, on 1, 38, 1; and Kaelker, p. 280. The above-quoted passages excepted, however, we find the nominative always with the art. inf. in Polybius when the subject of the main sentence is referred to.

6. (a). The articular infinitive in its capacity as a substantive often stands in Polybius parallel in construction with a noun, the two being connected by *καί*. In Demosthenes (Weiske, l. c. p. 495), with whom this is common, when they both refer to the same thing, the noun gives the general aspect of it, and the art.

inf. the particular. Thus too in Polybius 1, 88, 3 *μεγάλην ἔχει διαφορὰν ἢ μετριότης καὶ τὸ μὴδὲν ἀνήκεστον ἐπιτηδεύειν ἐκούσιως*, and 5, 1, 5. 20, 5, 4. 27, 13, 4. Noticeable is 7, 13, 7 *ἐγγευσάμενος αἵματος ἀνθρωπείου καὶ τοῦ φονεύειν*. Other instances of the conjunction of noun and art. inf., where they do not refer to the same thing, are 15, 34, 6 *ἅμα τὰ πράγματα καὶ τὸ ζῆν ἀπέβαλε*. 8, 32, 11. 18, 54, 2.

(b). With *αὐτό* as attribute (Birklein, p. 93) we find the art. inf. 12, 28a, 2 *αὐτὸ τὸ συναθροῖσθαι φησι μείζον ἔργον εἶναι*, and 22, 13, 3 *δῆλος ὦν ἐξ αὐτοῦ τοῦ σιωπᾶν*. 15, 31, 13 *περιποιήσασθαι τὸ ζῆν αὐτὸ μόνον*.

(c). In apposition (Birklein, p. 94) the art. inf. is found several times after *τοῦτο*, especially *αὐτὸ τοῦτο*. 3, 4, 9 *οὐ γὰρ τοῦτ' εἶναι τέλος ὑποληπτέον, τὸ νικῆσαι*. So 4, 57, 11. 21, 22, 7. Frag. 46. 3, 84, 7 *τοῦτο δ' ἐκ τῶν ἐθισμῶν αὐτὸ περὶ πλείστον ποιούμενοι, τὸ μὴ φεύγειν μὴδὲ λείπειν τὰς τάξεις*. 3, 20, 4. 12, 5, 11. After *ἐπ' αὐτῷ* *τούτῳ* 1, 45, 11. 37, 1, 9. *ὑπὲρ αὐτοῦ τούτου* 1, 45, 11. *τούτῳ διαλλάττειν, διαφέρειν* 2, 37, 11. 30, 2, 4. For 12, 6a, 4 see under the dative.

Occasionally we find the art. inf. appositional to a noun, e. g. after *ἐλπίδος* 2, 35, 8. See below under the accusative.

7. *Tenses of the infinitive*.—As in Attic prose so in Polybius we find the present the commonest tense of the infinitive with the article. After the present the aorist is next in frequency, with about half as many occurrences as the present, while the perfect is much rarer (one-seventh of the present) and the future only occurs 12 times. We may notice the exclusive use of the aorist inf. after *μετὰ τὸ* and its prevalence after *ἅμα τῷ* and *χάριν τοῦ*; aorist and present are found in equal degree after *εἰς τὸ*, but in all other constructions the present, as is natural, is preponderant. The perfect is found in the largest proportion after *ἐπὶ τῷ* and *διὰ τὸ*.

The future of the articular infin. is such a rarity that it is worth while enumerating the instances. It occurs for the first time in Thucydides (see Birklein, pp. 52 and 94), and it is either used pleonastically in connection with phrases which contain an idea of purpose or futurity, as *ἐλπίς, πρόληψις*; or in oratio obliqua to express an action in the future. Of the former class in Polybius are 3, 48, 2 *ἐλπίς τοῦ κατορθώσκειν*, and 7, 15, 4. 5, 94, 9 *ἐλπίς ὑπὲρ τοῦ c. fut. infin.*, 16, 32, 4 *πρόληψις τοῦ πεσεῖσθαι*. 4, 3, 3 *πρόληψιν ἔχειν περὶ τοῦ c. fut.* Frag. 150 *φροντίζειν τοῦ c. fut. infin.* After *εἰς τὸ* of purpose 9, 9, 11. *χάριν τοῦ* 4, 9, 5. On the other hand, the future has its full force in 3, 5, 8 *διὰ τὸ κἄλλους πολλοὺς κατεγγυηθῆσθαι καὶ σπουδάσειν*, and 32, 16, 2. 24, 11, 14 *ποιεῖσθαι ὄρκους ὑπὲρ τοῦ μὴδέποτε κατελεύσεσθαι τοὺς φυγάδας*, and 5, 18, 6 *ὑπὲρ τοῦ τὸ δεινὸν ἦξειν ἐπὶ σφᾶς οὐδὲ διανοεῖτο οὐδεὶς*.

Somewhat similar is the use of *ἄν* with the aorist inf. which we find after *διὰ τὸ* 1, 61, 5. 3, 31, 3, and in 7, 13, 4 *τὸν βίον ἐφήσαμεν ἀπολογεῖσθαι τὸ μηδὲν ἄν ποιῆσαι μοχθηρόν*.

Madvig, *Syntax*, §172b, laid it down of the *meaning* of the articular aorist infinitive with accusative subject, that except when denoting purpose of any kind it always has a *preterite* force. Upon this Birklein, p. 95, remarks, that although it usually holds good, there are many such examples in which the aorist is not preterite. Thus he quotes Thuc. 7, 68 *τὸ δὲ τοῦσδε κολασθῆναι καλὸς ὁ ἀγών*. Thus too we may add from Polybius, 4, 84, 8 *κατ' οὐδένα τρόπον συμφέρει τοῖς Πελοποννησίοις τὸ γενέσθαι Φίλιππον Ἑλλείων κύριον*. 6, 24, 7 *ἀδύλου γὰρ ὄντος τοῦ ποιῆσαι καὶ τοῦ παθεῖν τι τὸν ἡγεμόνα, οὐδέποτε βούλονται κ. τ. λ.* And 11, 17, 2 *ἐπὶ τὸ καταλειπόμενον ὥρμησε τῆς ὁλῆς ἐπιβολῆς· τοῦτο δ' ἦν τὸ μὴ διαφυγεῖν τὸν Μαχανίδαν*.

*The Infinitive with τὸ as Subject and Object, etc.*

The infinitive with *τὸ* as subject in nominative and accusative, and as object, etc., occurs altogether 279 times in Polybius (89 in books I–V, 190 in the rest); a frequency which shows a great fall from that of Dem., Plat., and Xenophon. Taking the proportion by the page in the Teubner text, we find the average frequency per page of the infinitive with *τὸ* in the writers just mentioned is .4, but .19 or less than half of this in Polybius. This falling off is due to a large extent to the fact that the *τὸ*-inf. especially, and the art. inf. in general, is more consonant with a didactical and theoretical subject-matter than with narration. This is very clearly shown by the case of Xenophon himself; see Birklein, *Entwickl.*, p. 84: in the *Memorabilia* the frequency of the art. inf. in all constructions is 2.2, but in the *Anabasis* it is only .47; while, to take the *τὸ*-inf. by itself, we find its frequency in the *Memorabilia* is 1.07, but only .15 in the *Anabasis*. And in Polybius also the use of the subject infinitive with *τὸ* is chiefly characteristic of the non-narrative portions, being especially common in the digressions where Polybius explains the plan or purpose of the narrative; while the preponderance in Polybius of the narrative element accounts for the fall in the frequency of the *τὸ*-infinitive as compared with Demosthenes, Plato, and Xenophon.

1. As subject the *τὸ*-infinitive appears 151 times as nominative and 77 times as accusative. In the latter case it is the subject in an oblique sentence after *νομίζω*, *φημί*, *ἡγοῦμαι*, or in 'oblique narration'



with no governing verb expressed; less frequently the governing verb is *ὑπολαμβάνω*, *κρίνω*, *εἴποι τις ἄν*, *πέπεισμαι*, *οἶμαι*.

The tense of the infinitive is generally the present, but the aorist is almost as frequent; the perfect occurs only 6 times. Often an infinitival sentence with a subject in the accusative is substantivized by the *τό*. The predicate to the infinitive-subject is often an adjective with or without *εἶναι*, but in this case the article is not so necessary with the infinitive as when the predicate is a verb.<sup>1</sup>

The frequent recurrence of the same or a similar predicate shows the mannerism and stereotype character of Polybius' style.

Thus with *σημείον*, 11, 7, 3 *τὸ τοῖς ἀνθρώποις ὀργιζόμενον εἰς τὸ θείον ἀσεβεῖν τῆς πάσης ἀλογιστίας ἐστὶ σημεῖον*. So 10, 32, 12 *τὸ λέγειν ὡς οὐκ ἂν ᾤομην, τίς γὰρ ἂν ἤλπισε τοῦτο γενέσθαι; μέγιστον εἶναι μοι δοκεῖ σημεῖον ἀπειρίας στρατηγικῆς*. 2, 63, 5. 12, 6b, 3. 29, 5, 1. 30, 7, 8. Frag. 85. With *ῥάδιον*: 6, 3, 2 *τό τε γὰρ ἐξαγγεῖλαι τὰ γνωσκόμενα ῥάδιον, τό τε προειπεῖν ὑπὲρ τοῦ μέλλοντος εὐμαρές*. And 5, 33, 6. 12, 20, 7. 12, 25c, 5. 25i, 9. 28, 10, 2. With *ἀναγκαῖον*: 1, 1, 1 *ἴσως ἀναγκαῖον ἦν τὸ προτρέπεσθαι πάντας πρὸς τὴν αἵρεσιν τῶν τοιούτων ὑπομνημάτων*. And 1, 13, 6. 3, 21, 9. 12, 25i, 5. 3, 97, 1 *νομίσαντες χρήσιμον εἶναι, μάλλον δ' ἀναγκαῖον τὸ μὴ προῖεσθαι τὰ κατὰ τὴν Ἰβηρίαν ἀλλ' ἐνίστασθαι τοῖς Καρχηδονίοις, and similarly after νομίζω with ἀναγκαῖον 1, 10, 9. 16, 25, 2. 32, 4, 2. After ἡγείσθαι 9, 36, 11. 10, 2, 1. 9, 8. 18, 32, 13.*

With the perfect infinitive: 1, 4, 2 *τὸ προκαλεσάμενον ἡμᾶς πρὸς τὴν ἐπιβολὴν τῆς ἱστορίας μάλιστα τοῦτο γέγονεν, σὺν δὲ τοῖσι καὶ τὸ μηδένα τῶν καθ' ἡμᾶς ἐπιβεβλησθαι τῇ τῶν καθόλου πραγμάτων συντάξει*.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> The choice in such cases between the articular and the simple infinitive was no doubt often arbitrary, as, e. g. 29, 23, 3 *οὐκ ἤρεσκε διδόναι* followed by *ἤρεσκε τὸ διδόναι*. But the article was often omitted to avoid the hiatus; this is clear from such a case as 6, 56, 15 *σπάνιον ἐστὶν εὐρεῖν—σπάνιον ἐστὶ τὸ λαβεῖν*. Cf. 8, 2, 6 *σπάνιον εὐρεῖν ἐστὶ*.

<sup>2</sup> 1, 35, 2 *καὶ γὰρ τὸ διαπιστεῖν τῇ τύχῃ—ἐναργέστατον ἐφάνη πᾶσιν τότε διὰ τῶν Μάρκων συμπτωμάτων*. "Fortunae non esse confidendum manifestum" Schw. Casaubon, feeling the want of *δεῖν*, read from late MSS *τὸ δεῖν ἀπιστεῖν*, which Schweighäuser rejects, remarking that the phrase is 'proverbialiter et sententiose dictum, quo in genere amant Graeci omittere verbum *δεῖ*.' It appears to me much more probable that the original was *τὸ δεῖν διαπιστεῖν*, from which both the later variant *τὸ δεῖν ἀπιστεῖν* and the vulgate *τὸ διαπιστεῖν* would naturally arise. For the omission by copyists of *δεῖ* before *διά* and *δια-* there are several parallels; compare 9, 42, 6 and Hultsch, Praef.<sup>2</sup> xxxii.

23, 7, 4 *ὁ δὲ Φίλιππος καὶ Περσεὺς οὐχ ἡδέως ἑώρων τὸ γινόμενον οὐδ' ἤρεσεν αὐτοῖς, τῷ δοκεῖν τοὺς Ῥωμαίους αὐτῶν μηθένα λόγον ποιεῖσθαι*. Here Ursinus read *τῷ*, but *τὸ* is read in O, and the latter is surely preferable. *τὸ* has the support of the following passages: 29, 23, 3 *τοῖς δὲ περὶ τὸν Ἀρχωνα ἤρεσκε τὸ διδόναι*. 4, 49, 3 *ἡρέμιζε δ' αὐτὸν τὸ δοκεῖν Βυζαντίους ἐξαπασταλκέναι*.

As accusative-subject, besides the above-quoted instances the τὸ-infinitive occurs as follows: 2, 22, 11 νομίζοντες συμφέρειν σφίσι τὸ διακριθῆναι πρὸς τούτους. So 7, 4, 8. νομίζων καθήκειν αὐτῷ 21, 29, 12. 31, 8, 7. 37, 3, 2. And 6, 1, 6. 50, 3. 21, 13, 8. 18, 6. In 10, 7, 6 Schweigh. added ἐπισφαλές εἶναι, a conjecture which is supported by 28, 6, 4. Frag. 163. 11, 20, 6 and 28, 13, 10. ἡγείσθαι σφίσι συμφέρειν 5, 35, 12. 10, 39, 9. Similarly after ἡγείσθ. 2, 50, 6. 3, 1, 5. 5, 67, 13. 6, 42, 2.

5, 11, 4 τὸ δὲ ναοὺς ἅμα δὲ τοῖς ἀνδριάντας λυμαίνεσθαι, πῶς οὐκ ἂν εἴποι τις εἶναι τρόπον καὶ θυμοῦ λυτῶντος ἔργον; so 9, 10, 6. 17, 9. 32, 27, 7. After φημί 1, 80, 1. 5, 58, 4. 6, 1, 3. 12, 28a, 2. 13, 3, 6. 18, 36, 7. 22, 8, 6. 28, 21, 3. 29, 8, 7. Frag. 13. φάσκω 16, 26, 1. 4, 57, 11 ὑπολαμβάνοντες τοῦτο τέλος εἶναι, τὸ γενέσθαι τῶν πυλώνων ἐντός. And 1, 4, 4. 2, 47, 1. 12, 28a, 4 and 5. 29, 7, 6. Frag. 46. 2, 26, 8. τὸ μὲν διακινδυνεύειν ἐκ παρατάξεως οὐδαμῶς ἔκρινε συμφέρειν. 3, 107, 2. 5, 22, 8. 16, 20, 6.

As subject in oratio obliqua with no principal verb expressed we find the τὸ-infinitive 3, 15, 7 πάτριον γὰρ εἶναι Καρχηδονίους τὸ μηδένα τῶν ἀδικουμένων περιορᾶν. And 3, 63, 4 and 11. 4, 24, 6. 9, 42, 7. 18, 3, 8. 11, 8. 21, 22, 7. 22, 11, 4. 24, 14, 3. 31, 20, 6. 34, 4, 4. 37, 1, 4 and 15.

29, 19, 8 (in oratio obliqua) \* \* τὸ δὲ παρέντας ἐκείνον τὸν καιρὸν νῦν παρῆναι σπουδάζοντας διαλύειν τὸν πόλεμον, προφανές εἶναι τοῖς ὀρθῶς σκοπομένοις διότι τὰς πρεσβείας ἐξέπεμψαν οὐ διαλύειν ἐθέλοντες τὸν πόλεμον, ἀλλ' ἐξελέσθαι τὸν Περσέα. Here we have either an anacoluthon or some defect in the text. τῷ δὲ παρέντας would restore a construction, but the commencement τὸ δὲ παρέντ. seems to read soundly although preceded by a lacuna. Probably the sentence was begun with an infinitive with τὸ, and in the course of a long period the construction was forgotten.

9, 4, 6 ἐξ ὧν συλλογιζόμενος Ἀντίβας ἀδύνατον ὑπάρχον τὸ λῦσαι τὴν πολιορκίαν. After πεπεισμένος 1, 83, 3. οἶμαι 12, 25k, 9.

Lastly, in two passages which may well be regarded as specimens of involved structure, we find the accus. of the art. inf. as subject of an infinitival sentence also substantivized by an article. 9, 2 4, πρῶτον μὲν διὰ τὸ καινῆς ἐξηγήσεως δεῖσθαι, τῷ μὴ συμβατὸν εἶναι τὸ τὰς ἐπνιγνομένας πράξεις ἡμῖν ἐξαγγεῖλαι. 22, 13, 8 διατιθεμένων λόγους ὑπὲρ τοῦ—ἀδύνατον εἶναι τὸ κινῆσαι τι τῶν ὑποκειμένων.

2. As object, or in apposition to an object.

(a). The τὸ-infinitive as object is oftenest found with certain verbs indicating *rejection* of any project or plan. It thus occurs

10 times with ἀπογινώσκω and 8 times with ἀποδοκιμάζω, and with παρήμι, ἀπολέγω, ἐγκακέω. I, 44, 4 τὸ μὲν διακωλύειν τὴν ἐπίπλουν τῆς βοηθείας ἀπέγνωσαν. So I, 48, 10. 2, 65, 13. 3, 21, 6. 74, 5. 5, 1, 5. 70, 2. 8, 36, 2. 14, 10, 10. 31, 23, 8.

3, 95, 5 τὸ κατὰ γῆν ἀπαντᾶν ἀπεδοκίμασε, and I, 54, 5. 3, 86, 8. 6, 38, 1. 9, 20, 6. 10, 39, 7. 18, 48, 9. 31, 17, 3.

3, 106, 10 τὸ πλείω γράφειν ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν παρήσομεν. 2, 63, 1 ἀπολέγω τὸ χορηγεῖν. ἐγκακέω 'refuse' 4, 19, 10.

The phrase ἐκλείπειν τὸ ζῆν occurs three times, 2, 41, 2. 2, 60, 7 and 23, 10, 3. περὶ πλείονος ποιῶμαι, περὶ πλείστον ποιῶμαι with τὸ c. inf. occurs four times, 3, 84, 7 τοῦτο δ' ἐκ τῶν ἐθισμῶν περὶ πλείστον ποιούμενοι, τὸ μὴ φεύγειν μηδὲ λείπειν τὰς τάξεις. So 4, 61, 6. 18, 53, 3, and 24, 15, 3.

3, 81, 6 τὸ ζῆν αὐτῶν ἀφήρηται. 15, 34, 6 ἅμα τὰ πράγματα καὶ τὸ ζῆν ἀπέβαλε. 16, 34, 11 οὐδαμῶς ὑπέμενον τὸ ζῆν. 11, 28, 8 ἀποκτενῶν τοῦτον παρ' οὗ τὸ ζῆν αὐτὸς ἔλαβε. 15, 31, 13 περιποιήσασθαι τὸ ζῆν αὐτὸ μόνον. 3, 63, 6 τοῖς ἐλομένοις τὸ ζῆν 'choosing.' 10, 37, 4 κἂν ἡ τύχη δῶ τὸ νικᾶν. 31, 23, 8 προορώμενοι ('fearing') τὸ βουληθέντες καλύειν ἀδυνατῆσαι. After ζηλόω 'strive after' 23, 11, 3. λέγω 12, 28a, 7. 39, 10, 8 τὸ δ' ὑπὲρ τῶν πραγμάτων παθεῖν ὅ τι δέοι, οὐδ' ἐν νῶ ἔλάβανον. 27, 9, 7 μαρτύριον ἐποιοῦντο τῆς ἐαυτῶν ἀποφάσεως τὸ παραγεγονῆαι ἀλείπτῃν τινά. 7, 13, 4 τότε περὶ ἐν Ἀράτου τὸν βίον ἐφήταμεν ἀπολογεῖσθαι τὸ μηδὲν ἂν ποιῆσαι μοχθηρόν. Here τὸ is Schw.'s emendation of MSS τοῦ: "His life would show in his defence that he would not have committed anything base"; but the construction is very unusual.

16, 10, 1 ἐξ οὗ δὴ καὶ μάλιστα ἂν τις καταμάθοιτο μανιώδη γενόμενον Φίλιππον τοῦτο πράξει. So Mai edited, but Heyse corrected to καταμάθοι τὸ, which is adopted by Hultsch. It must be admitted, however, that the article has a very clumsy effect. Compare 5, 11, 7 Μάλιστα δ' ἂν τις καταμάθοι τὴν ἁμαρτίαν τὴν τότε Φιλίππου, λαβὼν πρὸ ὀφθαλμῶν κ. τ. λ. Perhaps the middle voice in καταμάθοιτο is simply due to a copyist's mistake for καταμάθοι.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> 29, 24, 3 ἐξ ὧν ἀπεδείκνυσαν σκῆψιν οὖσαν τὴν Ῥωμαίων χρεῖαν πρὸς τὸ διαλύσαι \*τοο βοηθεῖν. Here the article before βοηθεῖν was added by Ursinus, but does not improve the sense. In the sense required here, διαλύειν is not found elsewhere in Polybius, although it is frequently used of disbanding troops, and, in the middle voice, of raising a siege, or finishing a war. For references see Schw.'s lex. The gulf which separates these regular significations of διαλύειν from that which is required in this passage is thus bridged by Schweighäuser: "dissolvere vel dirimere negotium aut consilium, i. e. impedire; sic 29, 24, 3

(*b*). Accus. of the art. inf. in apposition to a direct object : 7, 8, 9 σκοπὸν προέθηκε κάλλιστον ἐν τῷ ζῆν, τὸ πειθαρχεῖν. 3, 20, 4 εἰ μὴ ἡ τύχη καὶ τοῦτο προσέειπε τοῖς Ῥωμαίοις, τὸ φρονεῖν εὐθὺς ἐκ γενετῆς. 12, 5, 11 αὐτὸ δὲ τοῦτο διορθώσαντο, τὸ μὴ παῖδα ποιεῖν φιαληφόρον ἀλλὰ παρθένον. Here may be added 12, 25k, 7 κατ' αὐτὸ τοῦτο χάριν ἔχει τοῖς Γελοίοις, τὸ μὴ γίνεσθαι τοὺς λόγους ἐν τοῖς πολλοῖς. Here the MSS have a lacuna, which Heyse supplied, reading κατ' αὐτὸ τοῦτο χάριν for κατα . . . χάριν. In two passages the accus. of the art. inf. is found in apposition to πρᾶγμα ποιῶν : 6, 1, 12 πρᾶγμα ποιῶν φρονίμου καὶ νουνεχοῦς ἀνδρός, τὸ γνῶναι κατὰ τὸν Ἡσίοδον ὅσῳ πλέον ἤμισυ παντός. 18, 33, 2 ποιῶν πρᾶγμα βασιλικόν, τὸ μηδὲ ἐν τοῖς δεινοῖς λήθην ποιεῖσθαι τοῦ καθήκοντος. Compare 4, 80, 4 with the nominative of the art. inf. : καλὸν τοῦτο Δεπρεάταις ἔργον πέπρακται τὸ—ἀντιποιήσασθαι τῆς ἐαυτῶν πατρίδος καὶ μὴ προσέσθαι τὰς ἐλπίδας. Similar, but looser in structure, is 5, 11 3 τὸ μὲν γὰρ παραιρεῖσθαι τῶν πολέμιων καὶ καταφθεῖρειν φρούρια κ. τ. λ.—ταῦτα μὲν ἀναγκάζουσιν οἱ τοῦ πολέμου νόμοι δρᾶν· τὸ δὲ κ. τ. λ., where ταῦτα μὲν takes up the preceding τὸ μὲν.

### 3. Accusative absolute.

This is a rare use of the accus. of the art. inf., which occurs also in Plato and Xenophon ; see Birklein, pp. 77, 100, and compare the genitive absolute. In Polybius it occurs only 2, 61, 3 τῆς γενναϊότητος οὐδὲ κατὰ ποσὸν ἐποιήσατο μνήμην, ὥσπερ τὸ τὰς ἀμαρτίας ἐξαριθμεῖσθαι οἰκειότερον ὑπάρχον τῆς ἱστορίας τοῦ τὰ καλὰ τῶν ἔργων ἐπισημαίνεισθαι.

### 4. Accusative of relation.

See Birklein, pp. 85, 97. This use of the τὸ-infinitive, in free relation with the whole sentence ("as regards"), is very common in classical prose, especially in Xenophon. Thus Cyr. 1, 6, 16, quoted by Birklein, τὸ γὰρ ἀρχὴν μὴ κάμνειν τὸ στράτευμα, τοῦτου σοι δεῖ

διαλῦσαι τὸ βοηθεῖν est impedire ne mittatur auxilium." I think the original reading here was διακωλύσαι βοηθεῖν, which gives exactly the required sense, and involves nothing more than Ursinus' addition of τὸ does.

For parallels compare : 4, 33, 8 ἐκώλυνον Λακεδαιμόνιοι μετέχεν τῶν σπονδῶν Μεσσηνίους. 20, 10, 6 τοῦ δ' ἀδυνάτου κωλύσαντος βουλευσασθαι περὶ τῶν ἐπιταπτομένων. 18, 41a, 1 κωλύειν τὸν Ἀντίοχον παραπλεῖν, and 30, 9, 8. These passages show that in Polybius, as in Attic, the construction of κωλύω without μὴ is permissible. μὴ is, however, found in 15, 13, 9 ἐκώλυσε μὴ παραδέξασθαι τοὺς ἐγγίζοντας, and 22, 11, 3 τῶν γὰρ νόμων κωλύόντων μηθένα δῶρα λαμβάνειν, where, however, κελυόντων would be an improvement.

It is true that in the above-quoted passages κωλύω, and not its compound, is the word ; but διακωλύω is found in Attic with the infinitive without and with μὴ, and Polyb. 1, 44, 4 is in phrase and meaning closely parallel to our passage : τὸ μὲν διακωλύειν τὸν ἐπίπλυν τῆς βοηθείας ἀπέργωσαν.

μέλειν. Of this character in Polybius is 9, 9, 2 τὸ προσβαλόντα τοῖς πολεμίοις πειραθῆναι λύειν τὴν πολιορκίαν καὶ τὸ—ἐπ' αὐτὴν ὀρμῆσαι τὴν ῥώμην,—τίς οὐκ ἂν ἐπισημαίναιτο καὶ θαυμάσαι τὸν προειρήμενον ἐπὶ τοῖτοις ἡγεμόνα.

5, 31, 3 τοῦ μὲν γὰρ μὴ τῆς ἀκριβείας διαμαρτάνειν τοὺς ἀκούοντας ἱκανὴν τοῖς φιλομαθοῦσι πεπεῖσμεθα παρασκευάζειν ἐμπειρίαν\* τὸ δ' εὐπαρακολούθητον καὶ σαφὴ γίνεσθαι τὴν διήγησιν, οὐδὲν ἀναγκαιότερον ἡγούμεθ' εἶναι τοῦ μὴ συμπλέκειν ἀλλήλαις τὰς πράξεις. Attempts have here been made to emend the τὸ-infinitive, but Reiske's τῷ δ' gives a wrong sense, and Casaubon's πρὸς δὲ τὸ introduces a hiatus. Close parallels might be quoted to show that a final clause would be natural here; thus ἀναγκαῖον is frequently joined by P. with a final clause, e. g. with ἵνα 1, 3, 9. 3, 21, 9. 2, 56, 2., with χάριν τοῦ c. inf. 2, 14, 2. 9, 20, 2. 18, 28, 12. Very analogous too in point of phraseology are 3, 36, 1 ἵνα δὲ μὴ παντάπασιν ἀσαφὴ γίνεσθαι συμβαίνει τὴν διήγησιν, ῥητέον κ. τ. λ. 1, 47, 1 ἵνα μὴ τοῖς ἀγνοοῦσι τοὺς τόπους ἀσαφὴ τὰ λεγόμενα γίνηται, πειρασόμεθα κ. τ. λ. and 32, 25, 7 συγκεφαλαιωσόμεθα τὴν ὅλην πρᾶξιν, ἵνα μὴ—εὐτελὴ καὶ—ἀσαφὴ ποιῶμεν τὴν διήγησιν. In the light of these passages the obvious correction of 5, 31, 3 would be τοῦ δ' εὐπαρακολούθητον, were it not for the clumsy and obscure construction which would result from having in the same sentence *τινὸς τοῦ* c. inf. clauses; and it seems probable that the use of τὸ c. inf. here is to be referred mainly to the wish to avoid the clumsy construction which would be involved in a final genitive of the infinitive—otherwise the natural phrase here. Hultsch rightly defends the accusative, and is supported by Krebs, P.-A. I 53, and 58 note. Krebs quotes from Dion. H. 8, 44 οὗτ' αἰδοῦς προνοοῦμεναι, τὸ μὴ ὀρᾶσθαι.

The τὸ-infinitive of relation was wrongly introduced by Dindorf in several passages where τοῦ μὴ is the correct reading. See under the genitive.

### Genitive.

Polybius uses the articular infinitive altogether 199 times in the genitive case, 75 in books I–V, and 124 in the remaining books. This is about the same degree of frequency as in Plato and Xenophon, but is lower than in Thucydides, and still more so than in Demosthenes.

I. With verbs it occurs 79 times, a frequency lower than those of Demosthenes and Xenophon, who especially affect this construction.

The verbs which in Polybius enter into construction with the

genitive of the articular infin. are nearly all of a character which do not admit of a construction with the simple infinitive without the article. They are joined elsewhere with a noun in the genitive, and an infinitive in construction with them has to bear the sign of its case. Consequently after verbs, except in the case of ἄρχεσθαι, ἀπελπίζειν, and παρ' οὐδέν ἐλθεῖν, we do not find the simple infinitive varying with τοῦ c. inf. as we do to some extent in the construction of nouns with the genitive of the art. inf.

As in classical writers (see Birklein, pp. 98, 99), so in Polybius we find an illogical μή with the genitive of the art. inf. after verbs of hindering and separation, etc. Thus: 2, 37, 11 τοῦτω μόνῳ διαλλάττειν τοῦ μή μιᾶς πόλεως διάθεσιν ἔχειν τὴν Πελοπόννησον, τῇ μή κ. τ. λ. 5, 4, 10 τοὺς νεανίσκους διέτρεψαν τοῦ μή τελεσιουργῆσαι τὴν κατάληψιν τῆς πόλεως. 2, 14, 6 ὁ δὲ λείπει τοῦ μή συνάπτειν αὐτῷ. 18, 22, 4 ἐμπόδιον ἦν τοῦ μή τρέφασθαι τοὺς πολεμίους (where the note in Hultsch is misprinted—τὸ and τοῦ should exchange places). In the three last of these cases Dindorf, consistently with his treatment of similar passages in Xenophon (see Dindorf's preface to his edition of Polybius I 52), substitutes τὸ μή for τοῦ μή of the original; a totally arbitrary proceeding which would introduce a construction unknown to Polybius.

Polybius' use of τοῦ c. inf. is characterized by the recurrence in the narrative of certain favorite phrases in which he indulges to an immoderate degree. Thus ἀπέχειν, ἀφένεος, and ἀφιστάναι are, between them, responsible for five-eighths of the genitives of the art. inf. in Polybius.

τοσοῦτον ἀπέχειν τοῦ c. inf. in classical prose is confined to Isocrates and Demosthenes (Birklein, p. 62), with both of whom it is a favorite expression; but neither of them is so fond of it as Polybius, who has 19 examples of the phrase. In Demosthenes and Isocrates τοσοῦτον ἀπέχειν is the most usual phrase, but other conjuncts, such as πολὺ ἀπέχειν (Dem. 20, 49), ἵσον ἀπέχειν (Dem. 15, 1), are found. In Polybius, however, it is *always* in the phrase τοσοῦτον ἀπέχειν ὥστε or ὥς that ἀπέχειν occurs with the genitive of the articular infinitive, except in one passage, 22, 4, 10, which is probably corrupt.

Examples: 2, 6, 9 τοσοῦτον ἀπέχον τοῦ πειράζειν ἀμύνεσθαι τοὺς ἡδικηκότας ὥστε τοῖναντίον συμμαχίαν ἔθεντο. So 1, 31, 5. 5, 9, 9. 74, 7. 12, 4d, 2. 22, 6, 2. 23, 17, 4. 24, 10, 9. 11, 14. 32, 23, 1.

Repetitions of the same phrase are noticeable, and throw light on the fixed character of Polybius' style: 2, 57, 3 and 9, 36, 4 τοῦ

παθεῖν τι δεινόν. 3, 8, 11 and 6, 58, 10 τοῦ πράξαί τι τῶν προειρημένων. 15, 5, 5 and 39, 18, 6 τοῦ κολάζειν. 21, 20, 9 and 39, 15, 2 τοῦ προσδέξασθαι τι τούτων.

32, 14, 7 τοσοῦτον ἀπέσχετο κομίσασθαι τι ὃν πρότερον ἐδωρήσατο. This Bekker corrected to ἀπέσχε τοῦ κομίσασθαι κ. τ. λ., comparing the identical words in Diod. 31, 27, 7 τοσοῦτον ἀπέσχε τοῦ κομίσασθαι τι τῶν πρότερον δωρηθέντων.

22, 4, 10 οἱ δ' Ἀχαιοὶ τοῦ μὲν διὰ στρατοπέδων ποιείσθαι τὴν ἔφοδον ἀπέσχον, πρεσβέυτας δὲ προχειρίσαντο πέμπειν. Here the MSS reading τῶν μὲν was corrected by Ursinus to τοῦ μὲν διὰ, but some further correction is still necessary. Apart from the fact that ἀπέχω everywhere else has τοσοῦτον with it—which is enough to suggest suspicion—the use of the active of ἀπέχω in the sense of 'refrain from' is unexampled. For parallels to ἀπέχεσθαι τοῦ c. infin. Weiske, p. 500, may be referred to. But the likeliest emendation of ἀπέσχον seems to me to be ἀπέστησαν, which is one of Polybius' favorite expressions. The following passages offer a close analogy to the above-quoted 22, 4, 10, in point of structure as well as sense: 1, 39, 7 τοῦ μὲν ἔτι στόλον ἀθροίζειν ἀπέστησαν, ἐν δὲ ταῖς κ. τ. λ. 10, 15, 8 τοῦ μὲν φονεύειν ἀπέστησαν, ὥρμησαν δὲ πρὸς τὰς ἀρπαγὰς. 16, 31, 8 τοῦ μὲν ἀντιμεταλλεύειν ἀπέστησαν, ἐπὶ δὲ τοιαύτην γνῶμην κ. τ. λ. 3, 19, 4 τοῦ μὲν διακωλύειν τοὺς ἀποβαίνοντας ἀπέστησαν, συναθροίσαντες δὲ, ὥρμησαν, and similarly 14, 5, 5.

ἀφίσταναι τοῦ c. inf., like ἀπέχειν, is a favorite with Demosth., and occurs 9 times in Polybius. Besides the above-quoted passages it is found 1, 87, 2 οὐ μὴν ἀφίσταντο τοῦ ποιεῖν τὰ πρὸς τὴν σωτηρίαν. 3, 2, 5. 4, 71, 1. In 2, 35, 8 the gen. of the inf. is in apposition to the genitive governed by the verb: οὐκ ἂν τις ἀποσταίῃ τῆς τελευταίας ἐλπίδος, τοῦ διαγωνίζεσθαι.

Like Xenophon (see Birklein, p. 88), Polybius joins ἀπογινώσκειν both with the genitive and the accusative infin. The latter is the commoner construction and Dindorf wishes to alter the three cases where ἀπογινώσκειν has τοῦ c. inf. These are 1, 29, 5 τοῦ μὲν παραφυλάττειν τὸν ἐπίπλουν ἀπέγνωσαν. 1, 48, 1 τοῦ δὲ λυμαίνεσθαι καὶ διαφθεῖρειν τὰς παρασκευὰς ἀπεγνωκότων. 9, 7, 9 τοῦ μὲν ἔτι προσκαρτερεῖν τούτοις ἀπέγνω. It need hardly be said, however, that Dindorf's proposals are rejected by Hultsch and Büttner-Wobst; see Hultsch<sup>2</sup> on 1, 29, 5.

ἀφήμενος has τοῦ c. infin. eight times; the active participle of ἀφίημι occurs, however, once, 18, 3, 3. Examples: 2, 68, 3 ἀφήμενοι τοῦ χρήσθαι ταῖς τῶν τόπων εὐκαιρίαις, τούτων μὲν οὐδὲν ἐποίησαν. 5, 104, 5. 6,

1, 1. 11, 14, 6 ἀφόμενος τοῦ μένειν ἐπὶ τῶν ὑποκειμένων—τούτων μὲν οὐδὲν ἔπραξεν. and 15, 29, 7. 16, 6, 7. 20, 9, 9. 31, 7, 3.

18, 3, 3 ἀφέντα γὰρ τοῦ κατὰ πρόσωπον ἀπαντᾶν τοῖς πολεμίοις, φεύγοντα τὰς πόλεις ἐμπιμπράναι καὶ διαρπάζειν. Here we find ἀφιέναι used intransitively with a genitive, a usage for which I can find no parallel. Possibly Aristot. Probl. 8, 9 ἀφέντες τοῦ κινδύνου is analogous (Bonitz).<sup>1</sup>

Similarly the following verbs are found with the genitive of the art. inf.: ἀντέχομαι 5, 100, 11 ἀντίεχτο τοῦ πράττειν τι τῶν ἐξῆς. ἐφίεμαι 28, 9, 4 ἐφίενται τοῦ μεγάλα τολμᾶν. ὀρέγομαι 21, 23, 3. ὀλιγωρέω 5, 66, 6 τοῦ γυμνάζειν τοὺς ὄχλους ὀλιγώρει. and 20, 10, 16 ἔτι μᾶλλον ὀλιγώρησαν τοῦ μηδὲν ἔχειν πέρας ὑπὲρ τῆς εἰρήνης. φροντίζω Frag. 150 φροντιεύειν τοῦ μηδὲν ἀδίκημα ποιήσειν τὸν Προυσίαν. προνοέομαι 12, 25k, 6 ὅτι προνοθεῖν τοῦ μὴ βουλευέσθαι τὰ πλῆθη. But πρόνοιαν ποιοῦμαι is commoner than προνοέομαι with the articular infin., and occurs so in classical prose, e. g. Demosth. 47, 80, which προνοέομαι does not.

μετέχω 23, 16, 13 ὅσοι μετέσχον τοῦ—ἐπανελέσθαι τὸν Φιλοποιμένα. ἐγγεύομαι "taste of" 7, 13, 7 ἐγγευσάμενος αἵματος καὶ τοῦ φονεύειν. κρατεῖν 10, 23, 9 εἰ κρατοῦσιν οἱ ἄρχοντες τοῦ σαφῶς καὶ δεόντως διδόναι τὰ παραγγέλματα: 'if they know how to.' See Schweigh.'s note comparing 39, 12, 4 κατεκράτησε τῆς Ἑλληνικῆς διαλέκτου. 4, 82, 8 κατεκράτησε τοῦ γενέσθαι στρατηγὸν Ἐπήρατον: "obtinuit ut." So 28, 13, 13. στοχάζομαι 4, 19, 10 στοχαζόμενοι τοῦ δοκεῖν μόνον, and 21, 28, 9. Compare Aristot. Eth. N. 4, 8, 3 στοχάζομαι τοῦ ἡδὺς εἶναι, and Dion. H. de Isoc. §2, p. 538, 13 καὶ τοῦ γλαφυρῶς λέγειν στοχάζεται μᾶλλον ἢ τοῦ ἀφελῶς.

16, 3, 12 αὐτὸς ἤμαρτε τοῦ τρῶσαι. 3, 63, 12 οὐδέποτε διεψεύσθαι τοῦ κρατεῖν τῶν ἀντιταξαμένων. 5, 4, 10 διατρέπω. 13, 3, 2 τοσοῦτον ἀπηλλοτριοῦντο τοῦ κακομηχανεῖν. 2, 37, 11 διαλλάττει 'differt.' 3, 32, 10 ὅσον τὸ μαθεῖν διαφέρει τοῦ μόνον ἀκοῦσαι. And so 16, 16, 4.

στερέομαι 23, 10, 10 τοῦ ζῆν ἐστερήθησαν. 11, 30, 3 ἀπηλλαγμένοι τοῦ ζῆν. Compare Isocr. 3, 6 οὐ μόνον τοῦ θηριωδῶς ζῆν ἀπηλλάγημεν. ἀποδελιᾶν "shrink from" 4, 11, 4 τοῦ μὲν ἐγχειρεῖν τοῖς ὑπεναντίοις ἀπεδειλίασεν. The only instance in classical Greek of this construction appears to be Xen. Lac. R. 10, 7, quoted by Weiske, p. 500; a parallel which renders unnecessary Schweighäuser's suggestion τὸ μὲν ἐγχειρεῖν, upon which, however, he does not insist. ἀπελπίζω has

<sup>1</sup> If ἀφέντα τοῦ, in 18, 3, 3, is to be corrected, either παρέντα γὰρ τὸ κατὰ κ. τ. λ. or ἀφόμενον γὰρ τοῦ κατὰ κ. τ. λ. would avoid the objections to ἀφέντα τοῦ, and of the two ἀφόμενον is perhaps the more probable, and might have been corrupted by confusion with the φεύγοντα in the following line.



τοῦ ζῆν 15, 10, 7, but the simple infinitive 9, 6, 8 (*ἀπελπίζοντες αἰρήσειν*) and 16, 30, 5. For the genitive compare Diod. 11, 38, 3 τοῦ ζῆν ἀπελπίσας, but ἀπελπίσαι τὸ ζῆν Diod. 17, 106, 7. See Goetzeler, de Pol. eloc. p. 23.

ἄρχομαι 'begin' 9, 32, 2 ἤρξατο τοῦ λέγειν, but with the simple infinitive in 16, 11, 2, where, however, Schweighäuser defends πολιορκῶν.

9, 12, 8 προσδεῖσθαι τοῦ λαθεῖν. λείπειν 2, 14, 6. 10, 17, 12 λείπει βραχύ τι τοῦ διπλασίου εἶναι. 12, 18, 5 λείπει βραχὺ τοῦ ἐπάλληλον εἶναι.

παρ' οὐδὲν (ὀλίγον, μικρὸν) ἐλθεῖν τοῦ c. inf. For this construction see Kälker, pp. 254 and 302; Krebs, Präp. b. P. p. 56; Goetzeler, p. 25. The cases are these: 1, 45, 14 παρ' οὐδὲν ἐλθόντες τοῦ πάσας ἀποβαλεῖν τὰς παρασκευάς, ἐκράτησαν. 2, 55, 4 παρ' ὀλίγον ἐλθεῖν τοῦ μὴ μόνον ἐκπεσεῖν ἀλλὰ καὶ κινδυνεῦσαι. 11, 7, 1 παρὰ μικρὸν ἐλθεῖν τοῦ λαβεῖν τὸν Ἀτταλον ὑποχείριον. and 10, 12, 11. 18, 19, 6. 30, 1, 5. 33, 3, 1. In the first two of these examples Cobet proposes to omit τοῦ, but the construction with τοῦ is too frequent to be so treated. The simple infinitive occurs in 1, 43, 7. 33, 1, 4, in both of which τοῦ is omitted to avoid a hiatus (Kälker, p. 254), and in 12, 20, 7; but the construction with τοῦ is paralleled by Diodor. 17, 42, 4 (Krebs, p. 57), and by C. I. G. 4896 C. 11, 12 (Kälker, p. 302).

In 6, 41, 1 ὅταν ἐγγίζωσι \*τοῦ στρατοπεδεύειν, τοῦ was added by Schweigh., but Krebs, P-A. II 52, has a very plausible emendation ὅταν ἔλθωσιν ἔγγυς τοῦ στρατοπεδεύειν.

Many of the above constructions with verbs are classical, and the rest follow mostly classical analogies. παρ' οὐδὲν ἐλθεῖν τοῦ c. inf. is the only noticeable novelty. For the classical parallels see Weiske, pp. 499-501.

## 2. With nouns.

Polybius follows classical precedent in his use of the genitive of the articular infinitive with nouns and adjectives. The construction of the art. inf. had already become established as a handy syntactical implement, and it is purely due to chance if a substantive takes the genitive of the infinitive in Polybius which is not found in a similar construction in classical authors. The only phrase which recurs with a frequency that stamps it as a characteristic is ἐλπίς οὐ c. inf., which is found 16 times with τοῦ νικᾶν and similar expressions. αἴτιος τοῦ c. inf., which occurs 13 times in Polybius, was already a favorite of all the classical prose-writers except Thucydides.

After many nouns in classical prose the genitive of the articular infin. varies with the simple infinitive without the article, a variation dependent on the taste of the author (Birklein, p. 101). Thucydides, for example, consistently joins *αἴτιος* with the simple infinitive (Birklein, p. 53), while other writers show a preference for τοῦ c. inf. after *αἴτιος*.

A similar variety is found in Polybius. In the case of *αἴτιος* and *ἐλπίς* he prefers the genitive of the articular inf., but in other cases we often find both constructions side by side. Thus the genitive of the art. inf. is found with *ἐξουσία* in 9, 36, 10 δι' οὓς ἔχετε τοῦ νῦν βουλευέσθαι τὴν ἐξουσίαν: 3, 29, 7 and 23, 14, 3, but the simple infinitive is found 15, 26a, 1 ἐξουσίαν ἔσχε μηνῦσαι τὴν πρᾶξιν. 5, 56, 8 and 32, 8, 7.

ἐννοιαν λαμβάνειν 15, 1, 12 μὴ μόνον τοῦ νικᾶν ἀλλὰ καὶ τοῦ σφαλῆναι πάλιν, but with the simple infin. Frag. 153 εἰς ἐννοιαν ἦλθε τὴν φρουρὰν ἀποτρίψασθαι.

ἐπιβολή 5, 62, 7 τοῦ μὲν ἐκ χειρὸς βοηθεῖν οὐδ' ἐπιβολὴν εἶχον. Compare Thuc. 5, 9, 6 τοῦ ἀπείναι—τὴν διάνοιαν ἔχειν. But in Pol. 2, 11, 2 τὴν πρώτῃ ἐπιβολὴν ἔσχε πλεῖν ὁ Γναῖος ἐπὶ τῆς Κερκύρας, where πλεῖν is Reiske's correction of πλείον.

ὁρμή 15, 5, 8 εἰς ὁρμὴν ἔπεσε τοῦ βούλεσθαι συνελθεῖν, but in 6, 44, 4 ὁρμὴ παραστῇ τοῖς ἐπιβάταις συμφρονεῖν.

σημεῖον 28, 17, 12 σημείον τοῦ δεδιέναι τὴν περίστασιν τοὺς Ῥωμαίους. But 12, 6b, 3 οὐδέν ἐστι σημείον ψευδῇ λέγειν τὸν Ἀριστοτέλην. Hence Hultsch's correction is not called for in 23, 13, 1 μέγιστον σημείον γεγονέναι τῇ φύσει ἡγεμονικόν, where he supplies τοῦ before γεγονέναι.

Except ἐννοια and ἐπιβολή these nouns had all occurred in the construction with τοῦ c. inf. before Polybius, and the following also are classical phrases. See Weiske, pp. 497–8.

ἐλπίς occurs 16 times in Polybius with τοῦ c. inf., six times in the phrase ἡ ἐλπίς or αἱ ἐλπίδες τοῦ νικᾶν. The tense following it is noticeable; the future occurs twice, the aorist only once.

(a) With present tense: 1, 49, 10 τῆς τοῦ νικᾶν ἐλπίδα, 3, 64, 3. 15, 11, 7. τὰς τοῦ νικᾶν ἐλπίδας 1, 62, 4. 16, 19, 10. 32, 2. τὴν τοῦ ζῆν ἐλπίδα 3, 63, 10. 6, 9, 8. τοῦ δύνασθαι 2, 51, 2. 63, 2. and 4, 32, 10. And in 15, 25, 29. 37, 1, 10.

(b) Future tense: 3, 48, 2 τὰς μεγίστας ἐλπίδας ἔχων τοῦ κατορθώσκειν τοῖς ὅλοις. 7, 15, 4 μίαν ταύτην ἔχοντας ἐλπίδα τοῦ κρατήσκειν τῆς πόλεως.

(c) Aorist: 3, 17, 5 παρελῆσθαι Ῥωμαίων τὴν ἐλπίδα τοῦ συστήσασθαι τὸν πόλεμον.

αἰτία 4, 39, 7 and 11. 41, 3. 11, 25, 2. 18, 31, 1. 23, 2, 6.

33, 1, 5 τὴν αἰτίαν ἔσχε τοῦ μὴ συντελεσθῆναι τὴν ἀπόλυσιν. And in 2, 38, 9 Hultsch<sup>2</sup> adopts the correction αἰτίαν for αἰτίον: ταύτην ἀρχηγὸν καὶ αἰτίαν ἡγητέον τοῦ—καταστήσασθαι. This correction rests on the parallel of 2, 21, 8.

15, 34, 5 ἀδυναμία τοῦ βασιλεύειν 'incapacity for.' 22, 8, 8 ἀρχαὶ πρόδῃλοι τοῦ συστάτος 'Ρωμαίοις καὶ Περσεῖ πολέμου καὶ τοῦ καταλυθῆναι τὴν Μακεδόνων ἀρχήν. 3, 69, 8 ἀφορμὴ τοῦ πράττειν τι. 1, 1, 2 διδάσκαλος τοῦ δύνασθαι—ὑποφέρειν. 6, 35, 12 and 36, 5 τὴν ἐπιμέλειαν ποιεῖται τοῦ κατὰ φιλακὴν βουκανᾶν. καιρός 1, 62, 6 τὸν τε τοῦ νικᾶν, ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ τὸν τοῦ λείπεσθαι καιρόν. 5, 98, 5 τοῦ πράττειν, 10, 19, 5 and 36, 5, 2.

λόγον ἔχειν 18, 15, 15 τὸ τῶν ἀνθρώπων γένος, δοκοῦν πανουργάτατον εἶναι τῶν ζώων, πολὺν ἔχει λόγον τοῦ φαυλότατον ὑπάρχειν. "Multa tamen dici posse cur stolidissimum habeatur": Schweigh. 5, 111, 7 καλὸν παράδειγμα τοῖς ἐπιγινομένοις ἀπέλιπε τοῦ μὴ ῥᾶδιαν ποιεῖσθαι τοὺς ἐκ τῆς Εὐρώπης βαρβάρους τὴν εἰς τὴν Ἀσίαν διάβασιν. 1, 22, 8 παρασκευὴ τοῦ ναυμαχεῖν. Frag. 76 τοῦ λέγειν ἀληθινῶς ταῦτα πίστις.

πρόνοιαν ποιεῖσθαι τοῦ c. inf.; cf. Demosth. 47, 80. Pol. 23, 17, 3 πρόνοιαν πεποιήνται τοῦ μὴθένα εἰσάγειν. 36, 8, 4. Frag. 157.

The genit. of the art. inf. after πρόνοιαν εἶχε is also restored with probability by Schweigh. in 11, 2. 10 οὐχ ἦττον πρόνοιαν εἶχε καὶ τοῦ σφαλῆς τοῖς ὅλοις ὁμοσε χωρῆσαι τοῖς πράγμασι καὶ μηδὲν ὑπομείναι τῶν προβεβιωμένων ἀνάξιον. For καίτοι of the MSS Casaubon proposed τοῦ and Schweigh. καὶ τοῦ. ὁμοσε χωρῆσαι is also a correction for ὁμως ἐχώρησε.

πρόνοιαν ποιεῖσθαι is also joined by Polybius with περὶ τοῦ c. inf. (11, 31, 7) and ὑπὲρ τοῦ c. inf. (3, 87, 5. 5, 10, 7); cf. Krebs, pp. 42, 100. πρόφασις 3, 108, 5 πρόφασις τοῦ μὴ νικᾶν τοὺς ἐχθρούς, and 4, 17, 10. τέλος 4, 57, 11. χρόνος 3, 112, 5 ὁ τοῦ μέλλειν χρόνος.

The following nouns occur in Polybius for the first time in this construction:

2, 40, 2 βεβαιώτην τοῦ μόνιμον αὐτὴν γενέσθαι Λυκόρταν ἡγητέον. Frag. 112 τοῦ μνησικακεῖν οὐδ' ἡντινοῦν ἔμφασιν ἐποίουν. καταρχή 15, 33, 1. τὴν κυρίαν ἔχειν 6, 15, 6. πείρα 8, 9, 6 τοῦ πολιορκεῖν πείραν λαβεῖν. συνηθεία 2, 20, 8 συνήθεια τοῦ κατακόπτεσθαι. 4, 76, 6 συνήθεια τοῦ μηδὲν ἡγεῖσθαι δεινόν. σύνθημα 8, 27, 3 ἐποιήσαντο σύνθημα τοῦ παρυδέχασθαι σφᾶς τοὺς φύλακας: "They made an agreement that the guards should admit them." Cf. Dem. 56, 1. τὴν ὁμολογίαν τοῦ ποιήσκειν τὰ δίκαια. πρόληψις 16, 32, 4 (The men of Abydos preferred death) μᾶλλον ἢ ζῶντες ἔτι πρόληψιν ἔχειν τοῦ πεσεῖσθαι τὰ σφέτερα τέκνα ὑπὸ τὴν τῶν πολεμίων ἐξουσίαν. παράπτωσις 12, 25k, 10 χωρὶς τῆς

ἄλης παραπτώσεως τοῦ διατεθεῖσθαι: an instance of the exegetical genitive 'the mistake consisting in.' Compare the same construction with ἀμαθία, Plato Apol. 29B (Weiske).

### 3. After Adjectives:

αἴτιος: τοῦ c. inf. is very common in classical prose after αἴτιος; see Weiske, p. 501. It is frequent in Polybius, e. g. 1, 40, 16 αἴτιος ἐδόκει γεγονέναι τοῦ πάλιν ἀναβαρρῆσαι. 9, 3, 9 τὸ παρ' Ἀννίβου σύνταγμα αἴτιον ἦν καὶ τοῦ νικᾶν τοὺς Καρχηδονίους καὶ τοῦ λείπεσθαι τοὺς Ῥωμαίους. And 1, 43, 8. 57, 7. 12, 25k, 6. 13, 4, 8. 15, 33, 6. 21, 13, 10. 23, 14, 6. 24, 11, 1. 27, 15, 2. In frag. 184 αἴτιοι τοῦ is restored with great probability by Hultsch's emendation of τῶ. See under the dative. ἀλλότριος 21, 11, 2. ἐμπόδιος 18, 22, 4. ἀπειρος τοῦ νεῖν 39, 9, 12. κύριος 29, 9, 9.

4. Genitive of Price. See Lammert, Fleck. Jahrb. 1888, p. 621; Madvig, Syntax, §65b.

In Polybius occurs the first instance of the genitive of the art. inf. used as a genitive of price. 3, 96, 12 λαβὼν παρ' αὐτῶν χρήματα τοῦ μὴ πορθεῖν τὴν χώραν, ἀπηλλάγη. 29, 8, 5 ὁ μὲν γὰρ Εὐμένης ἦτει τοῦ (MSS τὸ) μὲν ἡσυχίαν ἔχειν καὶ μὴ συστρατεῦσαι Ῥωμαίους μήτε κατὰ γῆν μήτε κατὰ θάλατταν πεντακόσια τάλαντα, τοῦ δὲ διαλῦσαι τὸν πόλεμον χίλια πεντακόσια κ. τ. λ. Compare §7 αἰσχροὺς εἶναι τὸ δοκεῖν μισθοῦ τὴν ἡσυχίαν ἔχειν.

### 5. Final Genitive.

The use of the articular infinitive in the genitive to express purpose (and sometimes result) is remarkable as being the only case-construction which is peculiar to the articular infinitive and not shared with it by substantives. Birklein, p. 55, enumerates the different theories of its origin and gives his support to that propounded by Kviczala (Wiener Studien, I, p. 239), by whom this genitive is connected with the Latin absolute genitive of the gerundive. According to this view, from denoting the sphere to which anything belongs, the genitive of the articular infin. or the gerundive comes to be used attributively with substantives and then in free relation to verbs and a whole sentence.

In classical authors the usage is never a common one. Thucydides, with whom the final genitive first occurs, employs it oftener (proportionally) than the other classical prosaists, and usually with the negative; τοῦ μὴ c. inf. occurring 10 times, τοῦ without μὴ only twice. In all, there are 33 instances in Thuc., Demosth., Lysias, Plato and Xenophon, of which 8 only are affirmative. See Birklein, p. 102; Weiske, p. 502. As expressions of purpose

with the articular infin. other constructions were preferred to the genitive by classical authors, Thucydides excepted, *ἔνεκα τοῦ* and *ἐπὶ τῷ* being favored by Demosthenes, *ἔνεκα τοῦ* by Plato and Xenophon, while Isocrates used *ὑπὲρ τοῦ* exclusively. With Polybius, the final genitive occurs 11 times, but is only one among several expressions of purpose with the articular infinitive; the others being *πρὸς τὸ*, *εἰς τὸ*, *ἐπὶ τῷ*, *ἔνεκα τοῦ*, and *χάριν τοῦ* c. infin., of which the last, with 78 occurrences, is the favorite. The negative is found with the final genitive in every case but one; *τοῦ μὴ* c. inf. occurs 1, 12, 6. 2, 34, 1. 4, 18, 11. 5, 31, 3. 102, 6. 7, 16, 7. 9, 36, 1. 18, 35, 3. 21, 25, 7. 28, 8, 6, and the only affirmative instance is 12, 28a, 2.

Before discussing these cases mention should be made of the ingenious but unsuccessful attempt of E. Lammert, *Fleck. Jhb.* 1888, p. 617, to remove every instance of the final genitive of the art. inf. from Polybius. In all the above-quoted cases except 9, 36, 1 and 21, 25, 7, which he omits to notice, L. gets rid of final *τοῦ* c. inf. by alteration of the text, generally by inserting *χάριν*. He suspects the final use in Polybius *a priori* from the preponderance of *χάριν* in final clauses, the preference of Polybius for prepositional constructions, and the rare use of final *τοῦ* c. inf. in classical Greek. In doing so, however, he fails to take into account the other final uses of the art. inf. in Polybius besides *χάριν τοῦ* c. inf., and understates the frequency of the final genitive in classical prose. In reality the final *τοῦ* c. inf. passages in Polybius are too many to admit of the shadow of a doubt of their genuineness.

In 5, 102, 6 *καὶ συννποκριθεὶς ὡς ἐμβαλὼν εἰς τὴν Ἡλείαν τοῦ μὴ δοκεῖν λίαν ἔτοιμος εἶναι πρὸς τὴν τοῦ πολέμου κατάλυσιν, μετὰ ταῦτα κ. τ. λ.*, relying on the analogy of 8, 26, 6 *κατηγορίας ποιούμενοι χάριν τοῦ μὴ δόξαι παρασπονδεῖν*, and 14, 2, 12 *τὴν ἀποστολὴν ἐποιήσατο χάριν τοῦ μὴ δόξαι παρασπονδεῖν*, Lammert thinks that *χάριν* should be inserted before *τοῦ μὴ δοκεῖν*. And against each of the several instances of final *τοῦ* c. inf. in Polybius he employs similar arguments drawn from Polybius' phraseology in other passages. 'At vero,' as Hultsch asks in his *Praef.*<sup>2</sup> xxx, 'ex ullo dicendi usu vel frequentissimo quem nos recentiores in aliquo scriptore antiquo observavimus, effici posse, ut ille omnibus eius generis locis eundem usum unice amplexus nihil praeterea, quod et apte diceretur et ornate, admiserit, quis est qui contendat?' In this particular case, as it happens, we can point to another passage, which L. has overlooked, where the same phrase *τοῦ μὴ δόξαι* is found in the final

sense: 9, 36, 1 *περὶ δὲ τῶν κατ' Ἀντίγονον ἕως τούτου βούλομαι ποιήσασθαι τὴν μνήμην* [ἕως] *τοῦ μὴ δόξαι καταφρονεῖν τῶν γεγονότων*. In spite of Kälker (p. 274) and Stich (p. 210), who defend the text, there can here be no doubt that Hultsch is right in bracketing the second *ἕως* as spurious. The sense requires a final clause to follow *ποιήσασθαι τὴν μνήμην*, and *ἕως τοῦ* cannot stand; and for final clauses following *τὴν μνήμην ποιεῖσθαι* compare 1, 20, 8. 2, 71, 4. 3, 7, 4 with *χάριν*, and 2, 35, 6 with *ἴνα*. Assuming, on the other hand, the original reading to have been: *ἕως τούτου βούλομαι ποιήσασθαι τὴν μνήμην, τοῦ μὴ δόξαι κ. τ. λ.*, we see how easily a scribe to whom the final genitive was unfamiliar would regard *τοῦ μὴ δόξαι* as in apposition to *ἕως τούτου* and would be led to supply *ἕως* before *τοῦ*. In this way the passage provides us with a powerful argument against Lammert, for the presence of the spurious *ἕως* before the final genitive shows that *χάριν* can never have stood there. Hultsch is followed by Krebs P.-A., I, p. 52, and Götzeler, p. 26. See Hultsch, *Fleck. Jahrb.* 1884, p. 477.

18, 35, 3 *μαρτυρίας δὲ χάριν ὁμολογούμενα δὲ ὀνόματα . . . τοῦ μὴ δοκεῖν ἀδόνατα λέγειν*. *Λεύκιος μὲν γὰρ κ. τ. λ.* Here *τοῦ μὴ δοκεῖν* also occurs, after a lacuna which is by Reiske filled up with *παραθήσομαι* or *παρέξομαι*.<sup>1</sup> 1, 12, 6 *ἐποιήσαμεθα τὴν ἐπίστασιν, ἀναδραμόντες ἔτι τοῖς χρόνοις, τοῦ μηδὲν ἀπόρημα καταλιπεῖν ὑπὲρ τῶν ἀποδείξεων*. Here L. inserts *χάριν* on the analogy of 37, 9, 7 *χάριν τοῦ καταλιπεῖν*.

28, 8, 6 *ὁ Γένθιος οὐκ ἐδόκει μὲν ἀλλότριος εἶναι τῆς φιλίας, ἐσκήπτετο δὲ τοῦ μὴ παραχρήμα συγκατατίθεσθαι τοῖς ἀξιουμένοις τὴν ἀχορηγησίαν καὶ μὴ δύνασθαι χωρὶς χρημάτων ἀναδέξασθαι τὸν πόλεμον*. Lammert in inserting *χάριν* before *τοῦ μὴ* in this passage, quotes, it is true, the following, where *χάριν τοῦ* c. inf. follows *σκήπτομαι* or a phrase of similar import: 39, 12, 11. 8, 28, 1. 5, 74, 9. 18, 11, 8. On the other hand, we find after *συνυποκριθεὶς* final *τοῦ* c. inf. in 5, 102, 6; after *οὐκ ἠπόρου*

<sup>1</sup> Lammert's proposal here is very ingenious but hardly probable; comparing 6, 54, 6 he inserts a line and reads:

*μαρτυρίας δὲ χάριν [καὶ]  
τοῦ μὴ δοκεῖν ἀδόνατα  
λέγειν, ὁμολογούμενα δὲ  
<ἀρκοῦντ' ἔσται ῥηθέντ'>>  
ὀνόματα κ. τ. λ.*

To support this emendation parallels from Polybius are wanted of *ἀρκοῦν ἐστί* used absolutely; in the passage L. quotes 6, 54, 6, and in 2, 56, 5 it is followed by *πρός*.

σκήψεων have πρὸς τὸ c. inf. in 3, 68, 9, and 29, 24, 3 σκήψιν οὖσαν πρὸς τὸ διακωλύσαι.<sup>1</sup>

7, 16. 7 τοῦ δὲ μὴ γενέσθαι μηδεμίαν ὑποψίαν τῆς ἀληθείας διέδωκε λόγον κ. τ. λ. L. here quotes χάριν τοῦ γενέσθαι in 5, 88, 6. 38, 9, 2. He has a much more complicated proposal in 5, 31, 3 and 4 αἰρουμένοι δὲ τοιαύτην ἐπίστασιν καὶ διαίρεσιν τῆς ἐνεστώσης διηγήσεως\* τοῦ μὲν γὰρ μὴ τῆς τῶν κατὰ μέρος καιρῶν ἀκριβείας διαμαρτάνειν τοὺς ἀκούοντας ἱκανὴν τοῖς φιλομαθοῦσι πεπεῖσμεθα παρασκευάζειν ἐμπειρίαν ἐκ τοῦ—παρνομιμήσκειν. τὸ δ' εὐπαρακολούθητον γίνεσθαι κ. τ. λ. For the first of these two clauses, τοῦ μὲν γὰρ μὴ διαμαρτάνειν, compare 3, 21, 9 ἡμῖν ἀναγκαῖον εἶναι δοκεῖ τὸ μὴ παραλιπεῖν ἄσχετον τοῦτο τὸ μέρος, ἵνα μήτε, οἷς καθήκει καὶ διαφέρει τὸ σαφῶς εἶδέναι τὴν ἀκρίβειαν, παραπαίωσι τῆς ἀληθείας—μήθ' οἱ φιλομαθοῦντες ἀστοχῶσι. And for the second clause, τὸ δ' εὐπαρακ. κ. τ. λ., see under the accusative. For Lammert's proposal see his paper, p. 621.

21, 25, 7 ἀπήγαγε τὴν στρατιὰν εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν, δοκῶν ἠσφαλισθαι τὰ κατὰ τὴν Αἰτωλίαν τοῖς προειρημένοις ἔθνεσι καὶ τόποις τοῦ μηδένα δύνασθαι κακοποιεῖν τὴν χώραν αὐτῶν. This is an instance of final τοῦ c. inf. which has escaped Lammert's clutches, and there are no parallel cases of χάριν to favor the supposition of its having dropped out here.

4, 18, 11 οἱ δὲ Λουσιᾶται νουνεχῶς δόντες τινὰ τῶν κατασκευασμάτων τῆς θεοῦ, παρητήσαντο τὴν τῶν Αἰτωλῶν ἀσέβειαν [καί] τοῦ μηδὲν παθεῖν ἀνέχεσθον. καὶ is read in the MSS, but is marked as suspicious by the 'prima manus' of the Vatican; and Hultsch brackets καί, and is followed by Krebs P-A, I 53 note. See Hultsch, Fleck. Jahr. 1884, p. 744. Lammert suggests that καὶ is a corruption of ἔνεκα, or that a whole line has been lost.

2, 34, 1 ἔσπευσαν οἱ κατασταθέντες ὕπατοι Μάρκος Κλαύδιος καὶ Γναῖος Κορνήλιος τοῦ μὴ συγχωρηθῆναι τὴν εἰρήνην αὐτοῖς.

Lammert makes out what is *prima facie* a strong case against the genuineness of final τοῦ c. inf. in this passage. He attacks it on the ground that σπεύδω and σπουδάζω are never used absolutely in Polybius, but are found either with an infinitive, or with a prepositional phrase like ὑπὲρ or περὶ τούτου τοῦ μέρους followed by a final sentence with ἵνα or ὥς (cf. 4, 51, 2. 5, 104, 9, etc.), or with ὑπὲρ τοῦ, περὶ τοῦ c. inf., as in 16, 17, 10. 22, 4, 4. This statement of usage is not quite correct. σπεύδω is, it is true, regularly joined with the simple infinitive in Polybius, but I have found no passage except

<sup>1</sup> Götzeler, p. 25, mistakes the final genitive in 28, 8, 6 for a genitive governed by σκήπτομαι, which would be unique.

the one L. quotes (4, 51, 2) where *σπεύδω* is used with *ὑπὲρ* or *περὶ τοῦτου*—*ἵνα*. In the other passages quoted by L. *σπουδάξω* is the verb, and where the question is purely one of usage, cases of *σπουδάξω* cannot be quoted to support a rule as to *σπεύδω*. Further, *σπεύδω* is never in Polybius joined like *σπουδάξω* with *ὑπὲρ* or *περὶ τοῦ* c. inf., so that there is no support from Polybius' usage for one of L.'s suggestions here, namely, to read *ὑπὲρ τοῦ μὴ*. Lastly, it is incorrect to say that *σπεύδω* is never used absolutely in Polybius; cf. 3, 78, 5 *σπεύδοντας δὲ καὶ μετεώρους ὄντας εἰς τὴν πολεμίαν*. 3, 92, 5 *Φάβιος δὲ μεχρὶ μὲν τοῦ συνάψαι τοῖς τόποις ἔσπευδε*. 3, 92, 4 *σπεύδειν ὄντο δεῖν καὶ συνάπτειν εἰς τὰ πέδια*. Thus there is no reason why *σπεύδω* should not be absolute here, with a final *τοῦ* c. inf., for in classical Greek *σπεύδω* may be so used with *ἵνα* and the subjunctive. Plato *Polit.* 264a; *Isocr.* 75a.<sup>1</sup>

In 12, 28a, 3 Lammert's case against final *τοῦ* c. inf. is much completer than in the other instances. It appears that *ὑπομένειν τι* is always joined by Polybius with *χάριν τοῦ* c. inf., and so L. inserts *χάριν* here: *αὐτὸς γοῦν τηλικαύτην ὑπομεμενηκέναι δαπάνην καὶ κακοπάθειαν τοῦ συνάγειν τὰ ὑπομνήματα*. He compares 18, 46, 14 *πᾶσαν ὑπομείναι δαπάνην καὶ πάντα κίνδυνον χάριν τῆς ἐλευθερίας*. And *πᾶν ὑπομένειν χάριν τοῦ* c. inf. he quotes from 1, 48, 9. 4, 31, 3. 6, 54, 3. 52, 11. 29, 9, 12 (to which add 21, 33, 7 *πᾶν ὑπομένειν χάριν τῆς ἐλευθερίας*). *τᾶλλα ὑπομένειν χάριν τοῦ* c. inf. 6, 42, 5. And 29, 7, 4 *πᾶν τι ἐπιδεχομένων χάριν τοῦ τὸν πόλεμον διαλύσασθαι*. In 1, 31, 8. 4, 76, 7 where *ἐφ' ᾧ* c. inf. follows *ὑπομένειν*, it is in reality dependent upon *πείραν λαμβάνειν*, which, as 27, 15, 15 shows, Polybius is fond of joining with *ἐφ' ᾧ* c. inf. In this case there is some probability in Lammert's conjecture *χάριν τοῦ*, particularly as *τοῦ συνάγειν* is the only instance of the *affirmative* final genitive in Polybius, all the others being instances of *τοῦ μὴ* c. inf.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Stich (de P. dicendi genere, p. 154) and Kälker, p. 283, are not justified in assuming that *σπεύδω* here governs a genitive of the art. inf., as *ἐφίεμαι*, *ὀρέγομαι*, etc., for in that case we should expect to find the same construction with substantives, which we do not.

<sup>2</sup> In two corrupt passages final *τοῦ* c. inf. has been proposed: 10, 46, 3 *τὸ δὲ βάθος (παρὰπεφράχθαι δεῖ) ὡς ἀνδρόμηκες, τὸ τοὺς πυρσούς αἰρομένους μὲν παρὰ ταῦτα τὴν φάσιν ἀκριβῆ ποιεῖν, καθαιρουμένους δὲ τὴν κρίψιν*. Here for *τὸ* Hultsch reads *τοῦ* and Krebs (P-A, I 53, note 1) supports him. Casaubon proposed *ἐς τὸ*, Dindorf *εἰς τὸ*, and this is the more likely. See under *εἰς τὸ* c. inf.

4, 74, 8 *οὐδέποτε πρότερον εὐφυστέραν διάθεσιν ἐσχῃκε τῆς νῦν . . . παρὰ πάντων ὁμολογουμένην κτήσασθαι τὴν ἀσυλίαν*. Here Casaubon added *πρὸς τὸ* after *τῆς νῦν*; but Scaliger proposed *τοῦ*, which Krebs l. c. prefers. Hultsch is,



For the later history of final τοῦ c. inf. see Krebs, P-A, I 54 ; it occurs with great frequency in the Septuagint and the New Testament.

#### 6. Comparative Genitive.

The genitive of the infinitive after a comparative is frequent in classical authors, especially in Xen., Plato and Demosth. See Weiske, p. 501 ; Birklein, pp. 78, 88. In Polybius it occurs 15 times, in 7 of which the comparative is negated. 2, 7, 10 οὐδὲν προϋργιαίτερον ἐποιήσατο τοῦ—ἐμβαλεῖν. Thus, too, after οὐδὲν προϋργιαίτερον ποιέσθαι in 4, 66, 2, 8, 27, 6. προϋργιαίτερον 29, 9, 7. οὐδὲν ἀναγκαιότερον 5, 31, 4, 8, 34, 4. οὐδὲν αἰσχίον 6, 56, 2. περὶ πλείονος ποιέσθαι 18, 53, 3. And 2, 61, 3, 3, 8, 10. 81, 1. 111, 2, 9, 14, 10. 30, 7, 8.

In 2, 64, 6 οὐδὲν περὶ πλείονος ποιούμενος τοῦ κατὰ λόγον \*χρῆσθαι \*τοῖς πράγμασιν, the MSS give τὸν κατὰ λόγον πράγμασιν A<sup>1</sup>, τοῖς κ. λ. πρ. A<sup>1</sup>R. The alteration τοῦ, and the addition of χρῆσθαι τοῖς is due to Schweigh. and adopted by Hultsch (q. v.) It is supported by the numerous cases quoted above of a negated comparative with τοῦ c. inf. ; but Krebs' proposal τοῦ κατὰ λόγον χειρισμοῦ τῶν πραγμάτων is attractive (Präp. bei P., p. 140).

#### 7. Genitive Absolute.

τοῦ c. inf. as subject in the genitive absolute is never common, and though it occurs but 7 times in Polybius it is more frequent with him than with any of the Attics ; see Weiske, p. 502. 1, 60, 1 παρὰ τὴν ὑπόνοιαν προσπεσόντος αὐτοῖς τοῦ πεπλευκέναι στόλφ τοὺς Ῥωμαίους. 6, 24, 7 ἀδύλου γὰρ ὄντος καὶ τοῦ ποιῆσαι καὶ τοῦ παθεῖν τι τὸν ἡγεμόνα. 18, 34, 7 ἥδη γὰρ κατὰ τὴν Ἑλλάδα τῆς δωροδοκίας ἐπιπολαζούσης καὶ τοῦ μηδένα μηδὲν δωρεὰν πράττειν. And 10, 36, 1. 12, 6, 4. 15, 30, 7<sup>1</sup> /

E. G. W. HEWLETT.

however, right in following Casaubon, not because the negative is absent here also, but because πρὸς is the correct expression after εὐφύης. See below under πρὸς.

<sup>1</sup> Kälker, p. 253, notes that, fond as Polybius was of the articular infinitive, 'ne huic quidem usui ita indulsit, ut hiatum admitteret' ; and compares 1, 60, 1 (quoted above) with 3, 40, 2 προσπεσόντος Ἀννιβαν διαβεβηκέναι. But with προσπεσόντος the simple infinitive is the usual construction ; see Götzeler's list, p. 26, from which it appears that the simple infinitive occurs, e. g. 5, 62, 4 προσπεσόντος αὐτῷ τὸν μὲν Πτολεμαῖον ἐξεληλυθέναι, and 2, 54, 10. 5, 46, 5. 7, 3, 7. 10, 42, 1, in all of which τοῦ might have stood without causing a hiatus. On this point of avoidance of hiatus see below under πρὸς, and Büttner-Wobst, Fleck. Jahrb. 1884, p. 115.